

**REMARKS**

In this response, claim 4 has been amended. No claims have been added and no claims have been canceled. Accordingly, claims 1-42 remain pending in the present application. Reconsideration of the above-identified patent application is hereby requested.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the identification of claims 2, 3, 12, 26 and 29 as allowable if they are rewritten in dependent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In addition, Applicant thanks the Examiner for identifying claims 4, 6-11, 13, 14, 17, 20-22, 27 and 28 as being allowable as they depend on claims 2, 3, 12, 26 and 29. Applicant has deferred making these amendments until a later time as Applicant believes that the claims as presented are allowable for the reasons cited below.

**OBJECTION TO SPECIFICATION**

The Examiner has objected to the use of the word "clevis" in the term "rotator clevis" by Applicant as the Examiner asserts the term "clevis" is normally defined as a "shackle." However, Applicant submits that its use of the word "clevis" is not objectionable as the complete "rotator clevis" term is clearly defined in the specification as comprised "of a tube 72 having a pair of spaced forks 74 extending therefrom." (Page 8, lines 24-25). As the Examiner is aware, an Applicant

Amendment Dated September 20,  
2004  
Reply to Office Action dated  
May 19, 2004

-9-

Appl. No. 09/884,706  
Atty. Docket No. 57111-5061

can be his/her own lexicographer. Thus, the Applicant has chosen to use the term "rotator clevis" to describe a preferred embodiment of the fork member structure 64. In view thereof, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the specification be reconsidered and withdrawn.

#### REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 5, 6, 18, 19 and 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,003,614, issued to Geer et al. (herein Geer). Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is requested in view of the amendments and addition made to the claims and of the following discussion.

It is axiomatic that for a reference to be anticipatory, each and every feature in the claims must be disclosed by the single reference. Geer does not anticipate the features recited in the pending claims to provide "an elongated member . . ., said elongated member including a first connector, and a rotator clevis secured to the elongated member." Claim 1, see also claim 23 ("an elongated member having at least one connector and a rotator clevis secured thereto."). As shown in FIG. 1, the elongated member (62) includes a first connector (66), and a rotator clevis (64) secured to the elongated member. As discussed above, the Applicant has chosen to use the term "rotator clevis" to refer to the fork member structure 64. In

Amendment Dated September 20,  
2004  
Reply to Office Action dated  
May 19, 2004

-10-

Appl. No. 09/884,706  
Atty. Docket No. 57111-5061

contrast, Geer provides only a connector (19) but not a fork member as claimed by Applicant. Further, Applicant notes that element 21 of Geer is not a fork member as asserted by the Examiner, but is described in Geer as "a pair of similar link members 21," see column 4, line 17. Thus, Geer does not teach a fork member.

In view of the foregoing discussion and the amendments made to the claims, Applicant submits that the § 102(b) rejections are overcome. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 102(b) rejections be withdrawn.

#### REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Geer, U.S. Patent No. 4,003,614.

Applicant respectfully submits that as claims 15 and 16 are dependent on independent claim 1, these claims are allowable, thereby containing the elements recited therein. Specifically, as discussed above, Geer does not teach the "fork member" recited in independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that Geer also does not suggest the "rotator clevis" structure.

In view of the foregoing discussion, Applicant submits that one having ordinary skill in the art, and aware of Geer, would not be motivated to provide a latching system including a fork member and, thus doing so, would not be obvious. Applicant

Amendment Dated September 20,  
2004  
Reply to Office Action dated  
May 19, 2004

-11-

Appl. No. 09/884,706  
Atty. Docket No. 57111-5061

therefore submits that the § 103 rejections are overcome. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejections be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

If any additional fees are due in this matter, please charge our Deposit Account No. 10-0440.

Respectfully submitted,

JEFFER, MANGELS, BUTLER & MARMARO LLP

Dated: 9/20/04

By: 

George G.C. Tseng, Esq.  
Reg. No. 41,355  
1900 Avenue of the Stars  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90067-4308  
(310) 203-8080 - phone  
(310) 203-0567 - fax  
CUSTOMER NO. 24,574

GCT/ke1

Amendment Dated September 20,  
2004  
Reply to Office Action dated  
May 19, 2004

-12-

Appl. No. 09/884,706  
Atty. Docket No. 57111-5061

3242644v1